



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/487,585	01/19/2000	Scott Wayne Weller	104433	3330

7590 10/27/2003

Oliff & Berridge PLC  
P O Box 19928  
Alexandria, VA 22320

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/487,585

Applicant(s)

WELLER, SCOTT WAYNE

Examiner

Nathan Hillery

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8,18,21,24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 0200 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2176

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Formal Drawings filed on 2/20/01.
2. Claims 1 – 37 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, 20, and 21 are independent.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 8, 18, 21, 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
grammatical errors.
4. **Regarding dependent claims 8, 18, and 24**, the clause **a link to another document source** (line 2 of respective claims) is duplicated; it is recommended that the duplication be removed.
5. **Regarding independent claim 21**, at the end of line 17 of claim 21, there is a period followed by a block of text. It is recommended that the block of text be removed or a semicolon placed at the end of said line. The Office will assume a semicolon is intended for purposes of this examination. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 – 29 and 31 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (US006605120B1) and further in view of Yang et al. (US006301586B1).

8. **Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 21**, Fields et al. teach that a set of *pages, possibly a single page, is retrieved from a content provider web server ... the web page is parsed to identify a set of selectable content elements ... a representation of the original web page is presented in a user interface, wherein the selectable content elements are demarcated ... the user will select some of the elements for inclusion in the filter ... the tool constructs the filter so that the selected content elements are extracted from a retrieved web page and reused in the recast web page* (Column 3, lines 4 – 16) and that *once the reformatted file is received at the client, the client browser interprets the HTML in the web page, presenting the content* (Column 3, lines 33 – 35), which teaches **an input circuit that receives incoming information, a content monitoring circuit** (inherent in parsing), **content injection circuit, and output circuit** ... Yang et al. teach that *the present invention relates to management of a database which includes such multimedia objects as text, images, sound, and video clips* (Column 1, lines 5 – 11), which is **a content database that stores injectable content**. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Fields et al. with that of Yang et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Fields et al.'s invention with *an improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output* (Yang et al., Column 1, lines 44 – 47). Further, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that because the combination of the inventions of Fields et al. and Yang et al. must be run on a computer with memory; therefore, it has **a memory that stores a location ...**

Art Unit: 2176

9. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Fields et al. teach that *a set of pages, possibly a single page, is retrieved from a content provider web server ... the web page is parsed to identify a set of selectable content elements* (Column 3, lines 4 – 7), which means **receiving information in the form of a document**.

10. **Regarding dependent claims 3 – 5 and 12**, Fields et al. does not explicitly teach **the specified location** ... However, Yang et al. discloses in Figure 14 that **the specified location is top, bottom, left margin, or right margin of document** (Picture Layout – horizontal, vertical), **the specified location is adjacent to any downloadable information identified in the received information** (Picture Layout – Diagonal), **the downloadable information identified in the received information is at least a file, a folder, a picture, a movie, a sound, or a document** (Picture Layout – Diagonal [to another picture]), and **the specified location to insert the injectable content is determined by a user** (selecting the print layout). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Fields et al. with that of Yang et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Fields et al.'s invention with *an improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output* (Yang et al., Column 1, lines 44 – 47).

11. **Regarding dependent claims 6 – 8, 16 – 18, and 22 – 24**, Fields et al. teach that *variations in which elements are preserved in the recast page are possible ... the logo* (Figure 4A.305) *is an optional feature ... it may be removed or reduced in size or replaced by a different logo ... the links* (Figure 4A.311) *are optional; they could be removed, reformatted or relocated ... the ad banner* (Figure 4B.313) *is optional* (Column

Art Unit: 2176

7, lines 16 – 27), which means the **injectable content includes nonselectable injectable content (logo), injectable content includes selectable injectable content (links, ad banner), and content includes a link to another document source ... (links, ad banner).**

12. **Regarding dependent claim 9 and 19,** Fields et al. teach that *it is an object of the invention to reuse web-based content without requiring a content provider web site to install special purpose software* (Column 2, lines 59 – 63), which means the **selectable injectable content provides processing without installing software on an accessing device.**

13. **Regarding dependent claims 10 and 11,** Fields et al. teach that *the tool constructs the filter so that when the filter is used, the selected content elements are extracted from a received web page from the content provider web server and reused in the recast web page ... as part of the process of identifying the selectable content elements, a set of varied headers can be used to retrieve multiple versions of the same web page ... the multiple versions of the web page are compared to identify static and dynamic content elements and marked as such* (Column 3, lines 12 – 20), which means **processing of the selectable injectable content is provided within a server and receiving the information at a server and associating the injectable content with the server.**

14. **Regarding dependent claims 13 and 14,** Fields et al. teach that *a set of pages, possibly a single page, is retrieved from a content provider web server* (Column 3, lines 4 – 5) and that *once the reformatted file is received at the client, the client browser*

*interprets the HTML in the web page, presenting the content* (Column 3, lines 33 – 35).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that since the invention of Fields et al. receives and presents web pages to clients via a server then it must provide for **receiving and forwarding using a wired connection or a wireless to a network**.

15. **Regarding independent claim 20**, Fields et al. does not explicitly teach a **graphical user interface** ... However, Yang et al. discloses in Figure 15 a **graphical user interface** ... It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Fields et al. with that of Yang et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Fields et al.'s invention with *an improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output* (Yang et al., Column 1, lines 44 – 47).

16. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, Fields et al. teach that *navigational features native to the hosting server have been added to the page* (Column 7, lines 6 – 7) and that *the invention allows the entry of custom code for filtering code behaviors outside the predefined filters ... special cases can be accommodated by adding a function in Perl, Java, JavaScript or a specialized filter scripting language* (Column 10, lines 21 – 26). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that the invention of Fields et al. can be implemented to have an icon be programmed to call the print function for the invention of Yang et al. since the invention of Yang et al. has *an improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output* (Yang et al., Column 1, lines 44 – 47).

Art Unit: 2176

Thus, the combined invention has **at least one injectable content includes at least one selectable icon to access at least one treatment option screen**. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Fields et al. with that of Yang et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Fields et al.'s invention with such a management system.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 26 – 29, 35, 36, and 37**, Fields et al. does not explicitly disclose **a treatment option screen**. However, Yang et al. discloses in Figure 13 that **the treatment option screen has an option to process downloadable information, the treatment option screen is separately displayed for each downloadable information, each treatment option screen is sequentially displayed for each downloadable information, each treatment option screen includes a selectable icon to return to a previous treatment option window (Back), the treatment option screen includes a selectable icon to accept the treatment (Finish), the treatment option screen includes a selectable icon to exit (Cancel), and the treatment option screen comprises at least one portion ... (Horizontal, Vertical, Diagonal)**.

18. **Regarding dependent claim 31 – 34**, Fields et al. does not explicitly disclose **a treatment option screen**. However, Yang et al. discloses in Figures 13 – 16 that **the treatment option screen lists each downloadable information (Left Box), the list includes at least one markable box (Right Box), and each marked box indicates that the associated downloadable information is to be processed**. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine



the invention of Fields et al. with that of Yang et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Fields et al.'s invention with *an improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output* (Yang et al., Column 1, lines 44 – 47). Further, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that since the combined invention already performs the demarcation of boxes in one manner then it would be trivial to make so that **each marked box indicates that the associated downloadable information is not to be processed.**

19. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (US006605120B1) and Yang et al. (US006301586B1) as applied to claims 1 – 29, 31 – 37 above, and further in view of Roosen et al. (US006618163B1).

20. **Regarding dependent claim 30**, Fields et al. and Yang et al. do not explicitly teach **the treatment option screen ...** However, Roosen et al. discloses in Figure 8 that **the treatment option screen has at least one first portion, at least one second portion, and at least one control for moving...** It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Fields et al. and Yang et al. with that of Roosen et al. because such a combination would allow the users of the aforementioned inventions to have access to *an invention that meets the need for enhanced printer status information, monitoring and control* (Column 2, lines 10 – 11).

***Conclusion***


21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sasaki et al. (US006351317B1) and Ikedo (US006538765B1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (703) 305-4502. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 8:30a.m. - 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

NH

  
**SANJIV SHAH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**